



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STATE, CHURCH, AND SCHOOL IN FRANCE

I. THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IN FRANCE

DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY
The Ethical Culture School, New York City

The study of any of the institutions of a foreign country—its political constitution, its religious ceremonies, its social conventions, its commercial and industrial methods—is not a mere indulgence of the feeling of curiosity which prompts us to wish to know everything that can be known; but such study has its direct and vital contribution to make to the comprehension, evaluation, and reformation of our own peculiar institutions. The time was, and not many decades ago, when the nations of what we may call western civilization visited each other with the same sense of rather idle inquisitiveness with which today a traveler from America or western Europe ordinarily visits the Orient. He hardly expects to be in comprehensible surroundings; he knows that he will not be in assimilable surroundings. He goes as an observer, his mind set on the contrast between the civilization he has come from and that which he has come to. He is looking less for instruction than for diversion. Such an attitude, of course, implies a superficial view of the society he visits, and results generally in a number of rather picturesque impressions which are kept alive, if at all, rather by reference to a set of picture postcards than by any deep reflection on the import and tendencies of the social institutions of the people visited.

Naturally, thousands of unthinking tourists still visit every country in this spirit of profitless inquisitiveness. But the reflecting man or woman no longer has this attitude toward the civilizations of western Europe. Even the picturesque costumes of the Black Forest and the gay paraphernalia of the Castilian bull-fights are yielding in interest to the agrarian question in German politics and the struggle for free education in Spain.

Of the manifestations of that true and travailing history which is the record of the progress of the idea of freedom, none is more worthy of study and admiration than the long struggle for a state system of free lay education which has been waged and is still being waged in our sister republic of France. Nowhere else, I believe, can the problems of the development of a system of free public education, exempt from the control of ecclesiastical authorities, and molded to meet the principles of a democratic state, be so advantageously studied today as in France.

All educational problems in France for the last century, and especially since the establishment of the Third Republic, have been moral problems; for the great absorbing need that has been felt by all the men who have labored for the cause of public education in France, from Condorcet down to Ferdinand Buisson, has been to build a school which should furnish the youth of the land training in the fundamental principles of the French Revolution: namely, the sufficiency of the human mind, illumined by the sole light of reason, to devise and maintain a social state in which every virtue shall have encouragement for its full perfection and every man find employment for his utmost talent.

Furthermore, there are certain traits in the French character and certain factors in French history which bring the development of institutions among that people into clear relief. I refer to the keen analytical power of the French mind; its passion for logical consistency and symmetry. Where other people, especially the English, have formed their political and social institutions rather by a process of experimentation, the French, rejecting empiricism, have first reasoned out what form their institutions should take, and then have insisted by legislation (or the guillotine) that the institutions should fit the form. Whatever practical disadvantage this method has brought—revolution in the place of evolution, political turmoil in the place of orderly development, demagogues and adventurers in the place of sane political leaders—nevertheless in one respect the French passion for complete logical consistency has been of

advantage to the student of French institutions; it has made the issues between parties clear, and has arrayed argument against argument in such full controversy that one can scarcely miss any considerable point in the discussion.

To take a historical example. From the days of Richelieu to the present day the one striking characteristic of French politics under whatever sort of régime (absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchy, empire, Jacobin republic, bourgeois republic, democratic republic) has been its centralization: the domination of king, emperor, committee, or clique in the capital. This centralizing idea, if traced carefully into the realm of political metaphysics, would perhaps be found to be only another aspect of that passion for logical symmetry which we have just noted as the dominating psychological trait of the French mind. We are not interested in its theoretical aspect here. On its practical side, it is of great importance to the student of French institutions, for it standardizes and unifies what he finds in other countries uneven, contradictory, exceptional, capricious, and often even illogical. England, for example, carries along a mass of traditions in her politics, her religion, her schools, which are hard to reconcile with the modern democratic spirit and difficult to appreciate fully in their remote historic origins. The French, of course, preserve certain national traits from generation to generation; but their institutions they do not preserve. Instead of slowly adding features to the old systems, they make new ones. They tear down the house and rebuild on the old foundations; while the English let the old part stand till it decays by the slow hand of time, and build a new annex—without being too much disturbed by the lack of harmonious political architecture.

Now, since education in every land and every epoch is but the expression, like every public activity, of the social ideal of that land and epoch, we shall find all educational systems directed toward what the people consider as most conducive to their social survival. The moral ideal of a community, whether it be to form saints or to train soldiers, to make scholars or to produce millionaires, will be reflected in the curricula of the

schools. Education might be called the normative aspect of the social life. Just as Plato found in the state the best subject for the study of justice, because the state was the individual "writ large"; so we may find in the school the best commentary on the ideal of the state, because the school is the state in the making. The public school in France developed out of a great moral-social movement, as it did among the Puritans of the new world. We shall, therefore, expect to find the public school in France striving to embody the principles of the movement to which it owed its birth, while all the time reflecting the peculiar psychological traits and historic inheritance of the French people. *The moral-social movement out of which the public school in France grew was the French Revolution; the peculiar features which the public school in France shows in all its development are a great tendency to uniformity, almost monotony, in organization and function, strict centralization of authority, uncompromising opposition to influences antagonistic to the revolutionary principle (such as the Catholic church), and firm belief that the faithful pursuit of an elaborately formulated program will make scholars.*

Before passing from these general remarks on French education to a brief historical account of the foundation of the public school in France, it is necessary to note the peculiar meaning of some terms which may easily be misunderstood. In the first place, "primary" and "secondary" education do not mean the same thing in France as they do with us. In America primary education is a preparation for secondary education, as secondary education is a preparation for what we call "higher education." The categories succeed each other. One passes from primary to secondary education only at one point—where the one leaves off and the other begins. In France, on the other hand, the *écoles primaires* and the *écoles secondaires* run alongside of each other, each containing students from the tenderest childhood to young manhood and young womanhood. The distinction between the two is not chronological, but social. In the *écoles primaires*, which are absolutely free public schools,

the children of the lower-middle class are found. Education in these schools is a preparation for farming, industry, and commerce. In the *écoles secondaires*, on the other hand, consisting of the *lycées* and the *collèges*, the pupils pay. These schools are "public" in that they are managed by the state (the *lycées*) or the municipality (the *collèges*); but they are private schools in that instruction in them is not free. The pupils of the *lycées* and the *collèges* are destined rather for the university and the learned professions, or for a place in the multifarious and highly developed officialdom of France. The tuition charges in the *écoles secondaires* vary considerably, according to the fashionableness of the quarter in which the school is situated, or the newness and elegance of the buildings; and the charges act as a sort of "social sieve" to separate the children of the rich from the children of the poor. The situation is analogous to that of New York or Chicago, where the well-to-do citizens generally send their children to private schools to avoid their association with the poorer children who crowd the public schools. A high French official would not have his son in the same school with his concierge's son. The boys may be the same age, and both studying the same subjects in the same grade; but the concierge's son goes to the *école primaire*, while the official's son goes to the *école secondaire*.

The *écoles secondaires* are, as we have seen, of two sorts, the *lycées* and the *collèges*. The *lycées* are state schools. They were founded by Napoleon as recruiting grounds for his hierarchy of officers and officials. There are now about 160 of these schools in France, including 42 for girls. The *collèges*, on the other hand, of which there are about 300 in France, are supported by the municipalities. They do not differ from the *lycées* appreciably in curriculum or in the social quality of the students; and one would find it difficult to discover anything in the conduct of the classes, the quality of the work done, the character of the boys, or the zeal and competency of the instructors, to distinguish the Collège Chaptal in Paris from its neighbor, the Lycée Carnot.

Of course, the French *collège* must not be confused with

our word "college." The *collège* was originally (as early as the thirteenth century) a foundation to furnish lodging and meals to a group of young men studying at a university; and European universities that have kept their ancient constitution still consist of a number of colleges, like Merton, Baliol, Magdalen, and a number more at Oxford. The name *collège* then got to be applied to foundations outside the university, especially by the Jesuits in their numerous schools organized in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. From that time on the word has been applied to what we should call a high school or an academy. So the *collège* is a much more venerable institution than Napoleon's *lycée*, although the latter type of school stands slightly higher perhaps in popular estimation in France today.

Another French educational term must be explained for fear of confusion with its literal English translation: that is the term *école libre*. The *école libre* is in no sense a "free school," as we understand the phrase, either in the lack of tuition charges or the liberality of the teaching. An *école libre* may charge an exorbitant rate of tuition, and teach a most bigoted or antiquated system of doctrine. It is simply a school which is no part of the state system—a *private* school. It is "free" of state direction, though naturally every free, or private, school has to conform to strict regulations to get the license to exist. The famous Loi Falloux of 1850 defined the *école libre* as "any school founded or supported by an individual or a society." All the church and convent schools which were in existence until a few years ago in France were *écoles libres*.

One further definition is necessary. The word *classe* in the French pedagogical vocabulary means a group of students under one teacher, while what we generally call a "class" or "grade" is called in France a *cours*. In the country schools in France, for example, one teacher may have a group of children comprising various grades; that is, he may have several *cours* in one *classe*, while in the large city schools each *cours* or grade may be divided into several *classes*, each having its own class-

teacher. The foregoing definition will guard against the misunderstanding of words occurring frequently in these articles.

Turning now to sketch the foundation of the public school in France, we must go back, as we do in the study of practically every force in modern France, to the great Revolution. Before the French Revolution there was practically no such thing as public education. The church, to be sure, had made some provision for the training of the youth in some of the dioceses of France; but the object of such training was rather exclusively the recruitment of the clerical order. Every student of the Middle Ages knows how great concern Charlemagne showed to have his clergy educated; how he invited Alcuin of York to direct his Palace School; how he wrote to the bishops in his famous Capitulary of 787, which has been called "the first charter of education in Western Europe": "We exhort you to apply yourselves to learning with perseverance and humility, which is well pleasing to God; so that you may be able to preach with greater ease and certainty the mysteries of the Holy Scripture: and let there be chosen men able, willing to learn, and desirous of teaching others." Ten years later (797) the Bishop of Orléans even went so far as to order the clergy in his diocese to open schools for the children of all their parishioners. The best German biographer of Alcuin, Herr Lorenz, says that "the lower orders in France had more universal education at the end of the eighth century than at the end of the eighteenth."

But the ages of confusion and anarchy which followed the break-up of Charlemagne's empire killed any germs of popular education that there were in these episcopal schools. And when learning was received as a part of that general rebirth of Europe which we associate with the Crusades, the rise of the Italian and French Communes, the organization of the guilds, the general loosening of Europe's steel corselet of feudalism—education took the rather aristocratic form of the university, guilds of scholars nominally under the control of the church, but constantly chafing under the ecclesiastical authority and venturing on doctrines and publications which outraged the orthodox

standards. Such primary instruction as there was from the twelfth century on was in the hands of the monastic orders, which virtually kept the monopoly of primary instruction in France up to the ministry of M. Guizot in 1833.

The Jesuit order was especially active, as we have seen, in organizing schools in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but the order was deprived of its right to teach in France in 1762, and the next year was banished from the country, to be dissolved a few years later by Pope Clement himself.

On the eve of the French Revolution, then, there was practically no primary instruction in France, except in the monastic schools. The universities and the *collèges* did not signify much to the people at large. They were exclusive establishments, attended by a very small percentage of the people, and following curricula that had little bearing on the duties of a citizen. They turned out wits and philosophers, the nobility of the robe and the nobility of the sword. If by any chance a son of the less esteemed bourgeois passed through their halls, he found himself a social outcast among his more reputable classmates. Danton complains bitterly of the exclusiveness of the university and the *collège*: "The old régime has forced us into the Revolution by educating us without opening any outlet for our talents."

When the Revolution came it enlarged the entire framework of French institutions. The great leaders of the Revolution realized that it was nothing less than the reconstruction of society that they were aiming at by their doctrines of the equality of each citizen before the law and the freedom of each man to the cultivation and expression of his inborn talent. They knew, as every company of reformers has known, that the life of their movement depended upon the education of the people. So Mirabeau, the greatest of the revolutionary statesmen, prepared a report dealing with the organization of a system of national schools. So Danton in one of his splendid sentences cried: "Après le pain, le premier besoin du peuple c'est l'éducation." And in the midst of its overwhelming duties the Constituent Assembly still had time to pass the famous

decree which has been called the *levée en masse* for public education: "There shall be created and organized a system of public instruction common to all the citizens, free in the subjects necessary for every man and distributed throughout the kingdom according to the population."

Before any steps could be taken to set in motion this great revolutionizing plan of a national system of public instruction, the Constituent Assembly had finished its work of constitution-making, and given place to the Legislative Assembly, which was designed to be a permanent parliament associated with the constitutional monarch in the government of France.

One of the earliest committees appointed by the Legislative Assembly was the Committee on Public Instruction, which included in its membership the philosopher Condorcet. Condorcet reported an elaborate plan of public education in 1792. The basis of his plan was the revolutionary principle of the equality of each citizen in the eyes of the state: "The Constitution in its recognition of the right which each man has to choose his own cult, and by its doctrine of the absolute equality of all the citizens of France, cannot permit in its public instruction the teaching of any doctrine which by repelling the children of any number of its citizens would destroy that equality and would give the particular dogmas of any party a preference contrary to the liberty of opinion of all. It is therefore strictly necessary to separate from moral instruction every doctrine of religion, and to allow in the public instruction no celebration of religious ceremonies. . . . These may be followed in the churches or synagogues of each one's choice." Condorcet's non-sectarian and completely lay system of education had some very fine suggestions in it. It contained such modern ideas as the adaptation of the program of study to the child's capacity and bent; the organization of excursions in connection with the study of botany, ornithology, and entomology; the arrangement of the material for study in cycles, so that the student should return to the same subject, but on a higher plane; the inclusion of courses in history, legislation, and sociology; the organization of the entire system of education

from the primary school up to a national society of arts and sciences, a group of the most distinguished scholars of the realm to crown the pyramid of learning.

Condorcet's plan called for the organization of 30,000 primary schools, 110 *lycées*, and the National Academy, at an estimated expense of 24,000,000 francs. Neither the money nor the teachers were available. It would have been a matter of some years at least to get fairly started on the plan—and the Legislative Assembly lasted less than a year. When we consider what the duties of the Assembly were from April, 1792, to its dissolution in September, the wonder is not that the Legislative Assembly did not carry out the plans of Condorcet, but that through all the stormy period of its existence it devoted two periods a week to the discussion of the subject of education.

The king deposed and imprisoned in the Temple with the royal family, the monarchy overthrown and a republic proclaimed, a convention met on September 21, 1792, to draw up the first republican constitution of France.

This French Convention, which sat from the autumn of 1792 to the autumn of 1795, was probably the most remarkable legislative body in the world's history. It was not legally a legislative body, but simply a convention chosen to frame a constitution like our own Constitutional Convention of 1787. But when it assembled it found so much urgent political business on its hands that it simply assumed the government of France and relegated the composition of the constitution to a more convenient season. When in the course of the next summer it hastily framed a constitution (the so-called Constitution of the year I), it showed no signs of disbanding and turning the country over to the constituted authorities. The king had been beheaded, war had been declared on all the surrounding nations, the sections of Paris were dominating the Convention completely, and the whole direction of the country was in the hands of the Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety, which by the aid of the Revolutionary Tribunal was purging the land

of suspected aristocrats. The Reign of Terror was beginning and the guillotine was claiming first its tens, then its hundreds of victims.

The years 1793 to 1795 are the years of the Jacobin republic—and that phrase tells the story of all the legislation of the period. The principles underlying the Jacobin program were professedly the principles of Jean Jacques Rousseau, as interpreted by the insufferably dry, pedantic, selfish, and heartless Robespierre. The Jacobin republic was omnipotent, anti-Catholic, anti-Christian, leveling, intolerant, propagandist. Rousseau, referring the reader to Plato's *Republic*, had written in his *Emile*: "Good social institutions are those which are best fitted to denaturalize men, that is to take away their absolute existence and give them a relative existence, to transport the self into the common unity. A child on opening its eyes ought to see the fatherland, and even to the hour of death, he ought to see nothing else." What in Rousseau's rhetoric was a counsel of patriotism, became in the Jacobin interpretation a divine decree to be carried out by the chosen chiefs of the nation, as the decrees of Jehovah were enforced against the Moabite and the Amalekite of old. The Jacobin *credo* was absolute. Robespierre was its prophet. The state was an indivisible unity—a democracy to be kept pure by the authorities, even if thousands had to be sacrificed to purge out the poisons of aristocracy and privilege. There could be no corporations, no associations, no institutions except those sanctioned and controlled by the Jacobin leaders. As the future purity of the state depended on the generation to come, the child must be safeguarded against any deviation from the true civic training in school or home. The child belonged to the state. Therefore, the father's right was lost or merged in the right of the state. Who could guarantee, except the Jacobin authorities, that the child would not at home receive training which would make him an aristocrat? "Let us take the children at the age of five years," said Morelly, "and bring them up in a uniform fashion, imbued with the true Jacobin principles, at the expense of the state." The ideal was the old Spartan ideal of Lycurgus.

France was to be turned into a training camp, not for soldiers primarily but for virtuous citizens. Rousseau had written in his *Contrat social*: "All that breaks the social unity is worthless." This was interpreted by the arch-priest of Jacobinism to mean that all that differed from the Jacobin uniformity was worthy of death. "We must re-create France," cried Billaud-Vareannes—who himself needed re-creation far more than the Nicodemus of the gospels. And the unspeakable Carrier, the infamous executioner of Nantes, gave expression to the Jacobin theory in its most brutal and logical completeness: "We will make a cemetery of France rather than not regenerate it after our own way."

This Jacobin program, in other words, was nothing less than the despotism of an irresponsible clique of men—made the more desperate and reckless by the very uncertainty of the tenure of their power—replacing the tyranny of a monarch, which was tame and merciful beside it.

It is not difficult to imagine what chance there was for a public-school system under such a régime. The Convention abolished the university and all the *collèges*, literary societies, scientific academies, libraries, museums, geographical societies, even botanical gardens, for fear of the existence of some center of aristocratic corruption beyond its control. When Bouquier proposed to allow the opening of free schools (*écoles libres*), he was met by the warning that a corporation of teachers would prove dangerous to the republic: "a new priesthood more to be feared than the old." The only plan of education that the Convention would consider was the Spartan plan of strict state régime; to take the children from the ages of five to twelve, and bring them up in common—food, clothes, amusements, lessons, speech, shoes and stockings, even, all alike. By a decree of the Convention (May 30, 1793) it was ordered that there should be a primary school in each town of 400 to 1,500 inhabitants, where the youth should be instructed in all things necessary for their duty as citizens (meaning, of course, as Jacobins), and that the teachers should be required to give public conferences before the citizens of both sexes and all ages at least

once a week. So the Jacobin schools were to be at the same time centers for the propagation of the doctrine—a sort of university extension program for the spread of pure civics. Furthermore, a progressive tax was to be levied for the support of this education, making the rich pay for the instruction of the poor.

The overthrow of the Jacobin republic in the summer of 1795 and the inauguration of the government of the Directory under the new Constitution of the year III delivered the state from the Spartan form of Jacobin education. But much of the influence of the Convention's spirit remained in the plans for the school system—and the tremendous centralization still observable in French education is due rather to the Convention than to Napoleon. He changed the object of that centralization somewhat, but kept and sanctioned by his great authority the principle of it.

The year 1795 saw the creation of the first public schools—delayed six years by the political and military exigencies of the Revolution, the rapid succession of the three revolutionary assemblies, and the cruel domination of the Jacobins. These schools were called the "*écoles centrales*." They were true national schools, supported by the state, destined to replace the *collèges* of the old régime, which had been dissolved by the Revolution. They were a great advance on the old *collèges*, in that they embodied the scientific learning of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which the *collèges*, under full religious control, had rejected. In the new *écoles centrales* were taught chemistry and physics, history and literature, drawing and music. A sort of civic ethics was taught under the head of history and legislation, but philosophical ethics found no place.

The *écoles centrales* were short lived, like every institution of France in the stormy score of years between the execution of Louis XVI and the Battle of Waterloo. But the influence exerted by these schools was great. They were in some respects a pattern to the great educational leaders of the early Third Republic for the establishment of the present system of primary education in France. They were the bridge between the old

collèges abolished by the Convention and the new *lycées* erected by Napoleon. In fact, their existence for a few years probably made Napoleon's system of *lycées* possible; for in spite of the great general's contempt for the revolutionary principles of education—the stiff political metaphysics of Jacobinism, its impractical concern with Sparta and Rome, Lycurgus and Brutus, the cult of Rousseau, and the arid rhetoric of Robespierre—he had to go to the *écoles centrales* to get the teachers for his *lycées*. He used the tools which he scorned.

It was in November, 1799, that Napoleon overthrew the Republic by the *coup d'état* of Brumaire, and made himself despot under the soothing title of First Consul. The interpretation of this event which he ordered taught in his schools later was that on the eighteenth of Brumaire the French ship of state, long buffeted by the winds of revolution, entered the port of safety. He certainly did bring quiet and order—the quiet of wills crushed, the order of a despotic hand. In the breathing spaces between his marvelous campaigns of victory, he returned to his capital and attended to the civil organization of his empire. The system of education was one of his first concerns, for he was wise enough, like the chiefs of the Jacobins, to know that the inculcation of his despotic program in the minds of the growing generation was the only hope of its continuance. He instituted the *lycées* in 1802, using a suggestion of Roland, made nearly half a century earlier, at the time of the abolishment of the Jesuit instruction, that a system be devised which should standardize education throughout France, bringing the provincial schools up to those of Paris. Napoleon's state-governed *lycées* did that. After his coronation as emperor, Napoleon grew bolder in his handling of all the institutions of France, and began more openly to use them as engines for the support of his own despotic power. He said to his Council of State in March, 1806: "In establishing a teaching body in France my chief aim is to furnish a means of directing political and moral opinion." What that direction meant we may learn from the catechism which Napoleon had taught in the primary schools and the *lycées*:

Q.: To whom do we owe obedience and honor?

A.: We owe obedience and honor to all in authority over us, but especially to our august Emperor Napoleon, whom God raised up to deliver our state from anarchy and restore the holy religion.

In 1808 Napoleon established the University, and decreed that public instruction throughout France should be confined exclusively to the University. This institution then became at once the monopolist of education in the state. It regulated all public education as it does today from a central authority. It placed the dispensing of education on the same basis exactly as the sale of salt or tobacco. It made education a government *régie*. To remove opposition to the imperialistic program of his university, Napoleon seriously curtailed the *écoles libres* which had grown up under the liberal policy of the Directory. The National Institute, established in 1795, was shorn of its chief section (that of political and moral science) because the great men who directed it (Volney, Cabanis, Garat, Lakanal) were opposed to Napoleon's absolutism and to the re-establishment of the Catholic church in France by the Concordat of 1801. The *écoles libres* were treated as poachers on the domain of the *lycées*. Little by little they were harried out of existence. Their course of instruction was limited to the lower grades; they were forbidden to teach any subjects taught by a *lycée* in a town where a *lycée* existed; their instructors were subjected to severe inspection; they were not allowed to take pupils in a *lycée* town until after the *lycée* was filled.

The instruction enjoined by Napoleon through the Grand Master of the University can easily be imagined. He would not have authors like Marcus Aurelius, Montesquieu, or Tacitus read, on account of their free criticism of rulers. Bossuet was his model and all those who, in his language, "entered with submission into the established order of their time." In Taine's fine words, he made his teachers "the literary coadjutors of public authority." We have interesting accounts by distinguished authors of the middle of the nineteenth century of their school days in Napoleon's *lycées*. Alfred de Vigny and Alfred de Musset tell how the Emperor's bulletins of victory were read

in the classrooms, and cries of *Vive l'Empereur!* interrupted the lessons in Virgil and Plato; how the geography lessons were the feverish tracing of the great Napoleon's marches against the Austrians and the Russians and the Prussians; how the subjects dealt out for essays and declamations were the victories of Bonaparte; how the thirst for liberty was stilled by the distribution of silver medals and colored ribbons; how after Austerlitz the schools were converted into drill-rooms for the army, and conscripts were taken from the benches to be led across the Rhine and the Pyrenees.

Finally, Napoleon undid the chief educational work of the French Revolution in restoring the authority of the Roman Catholic church in his university, a favor which even the agent of the Pope at the time of the negotiation of the Concordat had not dared to ask. By a decree of March 30, 1808, Napoleon abolished the lay character of education: "The basis of instruction in the Imperial University shall be the principles of the Catholic religion." Free thought was rigorously proscribed, and the bishops were given the right of inspecting the teaching in the *lycées*. On leaving the Cathedral of Notre Dame after the *Te Deum* in celebration of the Concordat, it is reported that Napoleon remarked to one of his officers: "Is it not as if the old order were revived?" "Yes, sire," replied the officer, "except for the million of men who died for you, fighting to abolish it." Napoleon little realized the strength of the old order. He thought he could use the forms of papal and imperial Rome without reviving their spirit or concerning himself with their historic content. He had himself consecrated by the Pope, and the Pope's anathema started him on the road to St. Helena. He put his university into the hands of the clergy, and they stripped it of all the scientific gains of a half a century.

With Napoleon's legislation of 1808, creating the monopolistic university and subjecting all instruction to the doctrine of the restored Roman Catholic church, the system of public education in France was fixed for a half a century, and the two problems were set which have absorbed the attention of educational reformers in France: namely, the centralization of

education in the state, and the relation of the church to the schools.

Under the restored Bourbons the scope and purpose of the University was little changed. The legitimate monarchy and the church were substituted for the Napoleonic empire and the church; the Charter for Bonaparte's catechism. But the University was still the seminary of state.

Of public primary education we can scarcely speak at all before the ministry of Guizot in Louis Philippe's day (1833). Till then the Sisters of Charity, the clergy, public-spirited citizens, associations and clubs, the Communes, provided here and there instruction for the younger children. For education is an imperious need, and not even the despotism of Robespierre and Napoleon could wholly stifle the freedom of spirit which the national occupation with scientific and historical studies engenders. The whole history of French education in the century past is the conflict of this spirit with the despotic and ecclesiastical fetters forged upon the system of instruction by Napoleon Bonaparte.

To resume briefly: the foundation of a system of public education in France was the work of the French Revolution. That movement in its splendid confident beginnings found men rational beings, capable of infinite progress, if only relying on their inborn reason. The Revolution boldly passed beyond all the hallowed bounds of the mediaeval world, remaking authorities and removing divinities. The twin sanctities of throne and altar had stood guarding the way to the boundless ocean, like the twin pillars of Hercules—a dread to the mariner; but the bold spirits of the Revolution pushed beyond, into the open. Political storms overtook the ship of state; and Napoleon "brought it back to port" and anchored it, in disgraceful servitude, by the *coup d'état* of Brumaire. But the vision of a free state in which every child should be given the opportunity to make the best of his talents through education, in which every man should be at liberty to form and express his religious and political opinions without fear of persecution, in which the idea of human brotherhood should harmonize all differences of

creed and divergences of polity, lived on, and has inspired a great company of educators and statesmen to labor unceasingly for over a century to realize the ideals first announced by the great renovators of 1789.

For the foundation of the public schools in France the reader may consult the following works: F. E. Farrington, *French Secondary Schools* (New York, 1910), chaps. i-iv; Th. Davidson, *Rousseau and Education According to Nature* (London, 1898); Ferdinand Buisson, *Dictionnaire de pédagogie*, articles "Convention Nationale" (Guillaume), "Lycées et Collèges" (Steeg); C. Hippeau, *L'instruction publique en France pendant la Révolution*, including the speeches and reports of Mirabeau, Condorcet, Romme, Lakanal, and others (Paris, 1881); Allain, *Œuvre scolaire de la Révolution* (Paris, 1891); M. Wolff, "Les doctrines de l'éducation révolutionnaire," in *L'œuvre sociale de la Révolution française* (Paris, 1904); Th. Hughes, *Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits* (London, 1892); A. F. Théry, *Histoire de l'éducation en France depuis le V^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1861).